UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,879	12/21/2001	Mary M. Bendik	99-024 CON	1000

29883	7590	04/19/2005

BARTONY & HARE
LAW & FINANCE BUILDING, SUITE 1801
429 FOURTH AVENUE
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219

EXAMINER
HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 September 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-15,17 and 19-26</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) <u>11</u> is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) <u>1-5,7-10,12-15,17,19-21 and 23-26</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>6 and 22</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 9/27/04 to the

application filed on 12/21/01 which is a continuation of the application 09/378,785 filed

on 8/23/99, now abandoned.

2.   Claims 1-15, 17, 19-26 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, 12, 17, 20, 21 are

independent claims.

3.   The rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Porter has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17, 19, 21, 23-26 remain rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter et al. (US Pat No. 5,845,067, 12/1/98,

filed 9/9/96) in view of Herr-Hoyman et al. (US Pat No. 5,727,156, 3/10/98, filed

4/10/96).

Regarding independent claim 1, Porter discloses:

-       creating a document profile that includes fields of attributes of a document for

        each of the documents (col 3, lines 45-55, col 7, lines 26-67, figure 7)

- each document has a unique identifier for identifying the location of the document content in the file system (col 11, lines 44-55) where the unique identifier being visible to users of the document management system and providing information about the document to the users (col 11, lines 44-62: the fact that the list of the document keys is *accessed by users* where *a document key consists of a document identifier* and a service identifier suggests that the unique identifier be *visible to users* since the unique identifier would be also accessed when users accessing the document keys; also, since the unique identifier provides the location of the document in the file system, the unique identifier provides information about the document to users)

- storing the document profile for each of the documents (figure 2)

Porter does not disclose:

- the unique identifier of a document including at least a first portion including information descriptive of an attribute of the document and at least a second portion including an automatically generated number

Herr-Hoyman discloses a scheme for generating a unique identifier wherein the unique identifier *including a short sequence of characters related to a company name*, possible *including additional characters or digits to ensure that the generated unique ID is unique* (col 3, lines 57-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Herr-Hoyman into Porter since Herr-Hoyman discloses a scheme for generating a unique identifier that includes a sequence of characters such

as a company name with additional digits, providing the advantage to apply the unique

document identifier scheme to generating a document identifier in Porter. By having the

company name with a number or a digit to *make each document identifier to be unique*,

each of the documents in the company can be identified from the corresponding unique

identifier among the other identifiers of other documents in the company, which is

equivalent to the group of unique identifiers corresponding to the other documents. The

combination of Herr-Hoyman into Porter would provide a fast way for identifying a

document when accessing a document in a database.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Porter does not disclose that the first

portion of the document identifier is descriptive of the author of the document.

As mentioned in claim 1, Herr-Hoyman discloses that the unique ID includes a short

sequence of characters related to a company name (col 3, lines 58-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to have combined Herr-Hoyman into Porter since Herr-Hoyman teaches the

sequence of characters is a company name and Porter provides author's name as one

of the properties of a document. This motivates to use the author's name instead of the

company name as a portion of the document identifier for providing the information of a

document.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, which is dependent on claims 1 and 2 respectively, as

disclosed in claim 1, Herr-Hoyman provides the sequential numbers in addition to the

sequence of characters to ensure that the generated unique ID is unique (col 3, lines 57-65).

Regarding claim 5, Porter discloses that when a new document is entered into the document management system, the document content and the document profile are indexed (col 11, lines 16-22) for the purpose of criteria searching. The document identifier, therefore, is generated from the beginning before the document is entered (col 11, lines 16-51).

Also, Herr-Hoyman discloses that the first step when creating the web pages, the author of the web pages enter company data, which is an attribute of a web page and is an element to generate the unique ID (col 3, lines 50-65).

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Porter discloses the step of creating a link in the document profile to a file type that is not created within the document management system (col 3, lines 45-65: the document profile is transmitted via the messaging system where the recipient of the copy of the document profile may be another file system or another server where another file system or another server is not within the document management system).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Porter does not explicitly disclose creating of an email message via a messaging system external to the document management system including a link to document profile using a selector within the

document management system so that the recipient of the message can access the

document associated with the document profile if the recipient has appropriate

authorization to access the document associated with the document profile.

However, Porter does disclose:

- the document profile is transmitted via the messaging system where *the recipient

  of the copy of the document profile may be another file system or another server*

  where it is clear that another file system or another server is not within the

  document management system (col 3, lines 45-55)

- the access permission for the document profile where different levels of access

  permission ranging from authorization to see, to access and edit the document

  content, or change the access permission depending on whether the individual is

  a member in the group or not (col 8, lines 10-34)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to have modified Porter to include the step of creating an email

message via a messaging system external to the document management system since

the recipient of the transmitted document profile can be *from another system or another

server, which means an external system,* and the fact that the *document profile is

transmitted by a messaging system including an email further suggests that the

messaging system of the recipient linking to document profile in the document

management system is external to the document management system.* Further, the

access permission to the document associated with the document file suggests that a

recipient of a transmitted document can access the document profile if the recipient has

an access authorization. Also, it was well known that in sending a message, a SEND

button, among other buttons on the window, is selected to press for sending a message.

Said button, thus, is considered as a selector in the document management system.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Porter discloses that the email

message via a messaging system external to the document management system

including a copy of the document using a selector within the document management

system so that the recipient of the message can access the copy of the document (col

3, lines 28-55: the recipient of the document copy is from another file system or another

server, which is external to the document management system; figure 8A, col 16, lines

59-65: accessing the document content based on the information of the profile; the

selector feature is mentioned in claim 8; col 8, lines 20-26).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Porter discloses the defining of

user access permission in the document profile, wherein the step of defining user

access permission includes the step of acquiring the identity of the user from a source

external to the document management system (col 8, lines 10-34, col 13, lines 45-61).

Independent claim 12 includes the limitations of claims 1 and 7, and therefore is

rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have recognized that

the file type is a word processing document as in Porter (figure 7, col 7, lines 29-31).

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, Porter discloses the file type is an email record (col 3, lines 35-50).

Independent claim 15 includes the limitations of claims 1, 7 and 8, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 17 includes the limitations of claims 1 and 9, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent on claim 10, Porter discloses that the source of identity of the user is an operating system security system or a database security system (col 14, lines 10-18).

Claims 21, 23-26 are for the document management system of method claims 1, 7-10, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

6.   Claim 20 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter et al. (US Pat No. 5,845,067, 12/1/98, filed 9/9/96).

Regarding independent claim 20, Porter discloses:

- for each document, creating at least one document profile that includes fields of
  attributes of an associated document content (col 3, lines 45-55, col 7, lines 25-
  67, figure 7)

- storing the document profile in a database (col 7, line 26 to col 8, line 34, figure
  2, #260)

- creating document content associated with the document profile (col 3, lines 45-
  48; col 7, lines 25-67, figure 2, #230)

- storing the document content external to the database in a file system of a first
  storage device (figure 2: the document content 230 is stored external to the
  database of the document profile 260 in a file system)

- defining in the document management system at least a second storage device
  to which the document content is to be automatically copied when stored in the
  first storage device (figure 8A, #842: copying document from file system to temp
  directory implies that the temp directory, which is equivalent to a second storage,
  to which the document content is to be automatically copied when stored in the
  first storage, which is the file system)

- automatically copying the document content from the first storage device to a
  second storage device (figure 8A, #842: copying the document content from file
  system, which is the first storage, to the temp directory, which is the second
  storage)

Porter does not explicitly disclose exiting document. However, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have

modified Porter to include exiting document since it was well known to exit a document

by closing it.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed 9/27/04 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 21, Applicants state that the Examiner admitted

Porter does not disclose the generation of a unique identifier for documents in a

document management system (Remarks, page 14).

Examiner does not agree completely.

In the previous office action, the Examiner showed that Porter does teach each

document has a unique identifier to identify the location of a document in a file system

(previous office action, pages 3, 12). The Examiner only admitted that *an identifier such*

that it includes at least a first portion including information descriptive of an attribute of

the document and at least a second portion including an automatically generated

number for identifying a document is not disclosed in Porter.

Herr-Hoyman discloses the unique identifier *for identifying a web page, which is a*

document, for accessing a document where each unique identifier is generated by

including <u>a sequence of characters such as a company name</u> and <u>additional digits</u> to

make the identifier unique (col 3, lines 57-67). Therefore, *unique document identifiers in*

a company are equivalent to unique identifiers in a group, and each document in a

company can be identified by the additional digits along with the company name

included in each unique identifier. This shows that Herr-Hoyman discloses "generating

a unique identifier for each of the documents, the unique identifier including at least a

first portion including information descriptive of an attribute of the document and at least

a second portion including an automatically generated number, the unique identifier

being visible to users of the document management system and providing information

about the corresponding document to the users so that each of the documents can be

identified from the corresponding unique identifier among a group including unique

identifiers corresponding to other documents" as claimed.

Regarding claims 7 and 12, Applicants argue that Peter does not disclose or suggest

further linking or creating a link in the document profile to a file type that is not created

within the document management system since the "link" feature of the invention links

documents from, for example, other database systems (i.e. e-mail, discussion

databases, calendar files, to-do lists, financial data warehouse system, and external file

that from a floppy, cd-rom, external file system, etc.) (Remarks, page 15).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Porter does disclose that the file is connected to a conventional messaging system

related to an email system, and the document profile is transmitted via the messaging

system where the recipient of the copy of the document profile *may be another file*

system or another server (col 3, lines 35-65, figure 2). It *is clear that the messaging*

system is not within the file system, which is equivalent to the document management

system. Therefore, such transmitting shows linking the document profile to a message,

which is a file type that is not created within the document management system.

Regarding claims 8 and 15, Applicants argue that Porter does not disclose or suggest creating an email message via a messaging system external to the document management system including a link to the document profile using a selector within the document management system so that a recipient of the message can access the document associated with the document profile if the recipient has appropriate authorization to access the document associated with the document profile (Remarks, page 16).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Porter discloses the document profile is transmitted via the messaging system where may be another file system or another server where another file system or another server is not within the document management system (col 3, lines 35-55). Porter further discloses the access permission for the document profile where different levels of access permission ranging from authorization to see, to access and edit the document content, or change the access permission depending on whether the individual is a member in the group or not (col 8, lines 10-34).

As mentioned above, the messaging system is *not included in the file system, which is a conventional data management.* The messaging system, thus, is *external to the document management system.* Associating the document profile in the messaging system with the document content in the file system (col 3, lines 45-48) show linking between the document profile and the message so that the access to each document is dependent on the user's authorization to see each document.

Regarding claims 9 and 17, Applicants argue that Porter does not disclose creating an

email message via messaging system external to the document management system

including a copy of the document using a selector within the document management

system so that a recipient of the message can access the copy of the document

(Remarks, page 17).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Porter discloses the messaging (email) system stores the document profile (figure 2,

#260) where *the messaging system is external to the file system*, which is a

conventional data management (figure 2, col 3, lines 28-34) and equivalent to the

document management system as claimed. Porter further discloses that a user can

access a document profile dependent on the access permission of the user (col 8, lines

10-26). Since the document profile is included in the messaging system, the fact that a

user can access the document profile suggests that the messaging system, external to

the file system, take the user to the document profile if the user has an access

authorization. Also, the fact that *a user can access and edit a document associated*

with a document profile if the user has an access permission (col 8, lines 10-26) shows

that the external messaging system can be used to route a document upon selecting

the document using a selector for a proper profile for user.

Regarding independent claim 20, Applicants argue that Porter does not disclose or

suggest a document management system in which one can define at least a second

storage area to which the document content is to be copied when stored in the first

storage and subsequent automatic copying a saved document to that second storage

area (Remarks, page 19).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Porter discloses a first storage, which is the file system for storing documents (figure 2,

#220, #230). Porter also discloses that a second storage, which is the temp directory, is

defined, so that document in the file system is copied to the temp directory (figure 8A,

#842).

Allowable Subject Matter

8.   Claims 6, 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims.

9.   Claim 11 is allowed.

10.   The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject

matter: "requiring selection of a predefined document template from a set of predefined

document templates for the document during creation of the document profile" is novel

and non-obvious over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Mohr et al. (US Pat No. 6,826,727 B1, 11/30/04, filed 11/24/99).

Nehab et al. (US Pat No. 6,029,182, 2/22/00, filed 10/4/96).

Bernardo et al. (US Pat No. 6,684,369 B1, 1/27/04, filed 6/19/98).

Bernardo et al. (US Pat No. 6,185,587 B1, 2/6/01, filed 6/19/98).

BROSTER et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2002/0073056 A1, 6/13/02, filed 10/15/98).

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-
4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for
the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4125.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cong-Lac Huynh
Examiner
Art Unit 2178
04/12/05